DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 257 222 EA 017 788

AUTHOR Behling, Herman E., Jr.
TITLE The Effective School. Monograph Series No. 10.
INSTITUTION Maryland Association of Teacher Educators.; Maryland State Dept. of Education, Baltimore.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 23p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Achievement Gains; Administrator Characteristics; *Educational Environment; *Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Leadership; *Principals; Research Methodology; *School Effectiveness; Values
IDENTIFIERS Administrator Behavior *Effective Schools Research; Instructional Leadership

ABSTRACT

This survey of the effective schools research findings briefly comments on the research methodology of the studies cited, then lists the research findings related to school processes and outcomes and to the principal. Those findings related to school processes and outcomes are divided into the following categories: A Safe and Orderly Environment, School Climate, School Values and Norms, and Improved Student Achievement. Findings related to the principal are discussed under the following categories: The Debate on Instructional Leadership, Characteristics of Effective Principals, and Descriptive Studies--The Journalists' Report. Concluding remarks and a bibliography listing 37 references are also included. (DCS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED257222

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. A. Crenson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 017 785

FOREWORD

Herman E. Behling, Jr. is the Assistant State Superintendent in Certification and Accreditation with the Maryland State Department of Education. He holds a Bachelor's degree from Kent State University and Master's and Doctor's degrees from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Dr. Behling has been an elementary school teacher in the Ohio School System. He has also served as Vice Principal in the Lida Lee Tall Learning Center of Towson State University and Principal of the Pullen Laboratory School at Frostburg State College. Dr. Behling has been on the faculty in the Education departments of Frostburg State College, Towson State University, and Western Maryland College. During the last 18 years, he has held positions in the Maryland State Department of Education as the State Consultant for Student Teaching, Coordinator of the Office of Teacher Education, Administrator in Certification and Teacher Education, and Administrator of the Maryland Professional Development Academy.

This paper has been sponsored by the Maryland Unit of the Association of Teacher Educators and Maryland State Department of Education for the purpose of providing the reader with an awareness level of the effective school research findings. The Maryland Association of Teacher Educators extends its sincere appreciation to Dr. Behling for his time and efforts in the preparation of this monograph.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A WORD ABOUT METHODOLOGY. 1

SCHOOL PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES 2

A Safe and Orderly Environment 3

School Size and Impersonality 3

Systematic School Discipline. 3

Arbitrariness and Student Frustration 4

A School's Reward Structure 5

Alienation. 5

School Climate 6

Ethos 6

Social Structure of a Classroom 6

School Values and Norms. 7

Teacher Expectations. 7

The Teacher As a Model. 8

Feedback Students Receive 9

Consistency of Schools' Value 9

Improved Student Achievement 10

High Achieving Schools. 10

Low Achieving Schools 11

THE PRINCIPAL 11

The Debate on Instructional Leadership 12

Characteristics of Effective Principals. 13

Descriptive Studies - The Journalists' Report. 15

CONCLUDING REMARKS. 15

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 17

THE EFFECTIVE SCHOOL

Educators have always been interested in effective schools, what makes them that way, and how one knows when a school is effective. During the past decade there has been a renewed interest in research which points to characteristics of effective schools and to specific details which can be of value to educators who are attempting to improve their schools and their programs.

A WORD ABOUT METHODOLOGY

To determine whether a school is effective, one must have a reference point such as student achievement, faculty satisfaction, the condition of the building, or the school climate. Studies about a safe and orderly school, for example, usually use the incidence of vandalism or violence to identify effective and non-effective schools. Some educators have criticized research which does not focus on one aspect of a school, and these educators point to studies which identify effective schools according to some state criteria and then attempt to deduce that certain factors which were prominent in the program were important in bringing about the result. The research tends to be correlational which would suggest that the factors identified are the important ones, but, since these studies were not true experiments which started out to implement a new approach and to test its effectiveness, other factors than others identified could be causing the result.

At least five different kinds of studies on effective schools are used in this paper. They are

1. studies that correlate factors in safe schools
2. studies that compare high-achieving and low achieving schools
3. studies that focus on quantifiable input-output relationships

4. longitudinal studies of schools which have success rates above expectations.

SCHOOL PROCESSES AND OUTCOMES

A considerable body of research over the past decade has shown that schools do make a difference and some schools make more of a difference than others. The Maryland study entitled, Process Evaluation: A Comprehensive Study of Outliers is an excellent analysis of massive amounts of data on student achievement from every elementary school in Maryland.[1] The research team which conducted this study determined the anticipated achievement level for every school building in the state and compared these data with the actual achievement for these same buildings. The discrepancies between anticipated and actual achievement were placed on a continuum, and the processes going in the "outlier" schools were studied. There can be little doubt that some schools are more effective than others.

Dale Mann analyzed seven studies of effective schools which identified a series of factors which were found to be important in all these studies, and the findings are similar to the Maryland study.[2] Mann's factors are: principals' characteristics and behavior, teachers' characteristics and behavior, school climate, instructional emphasis, pupil evaluation, and appropriate resources.

---

[1] Maryland State Department of Education, Process Evaluation: A Comprehensive Study of Outliers (Baltimore: The Maryland State Department of Education, 1978).

[2] Dale Mann, "The Instructional Effective School: A Planning and Feasibility Study" prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York, May 1979 (Teachers College, Columbia University).

A SAFE AND ORDERLY ENVIRONMENT

In 1978 the Department of Health, Education and Welfare completed extensive research on schools chosen at random from urban, suburban, and rural schools across the country.[1] This study analyzed data on violent and safe schools and identified such important factors as school size and impersonality, systematic school discipline, arbitrariness and student frustration, the school's reward structure, and alienation.

School Size and Impersonality

The Safe Schools study showed that large schools tended to have greater property loss than did small schools. This result was especially apparent in such factors as the incidence of burglary, theft, and vandalism. Also, larger schools tended to show higher incidence of violence. The difference between these two categories is that one is attacks against property, while the other is attacks against people. Schools with greater amounts of school violence had higher teacher-pupil ratios. The more students each teacher taught each day, the greater tended to be the amount of school violence.

As students felt greater distance between themselves and their teachers, there tended to be increased property loss in the school. Where students could go unnoticed and where teachers' contact with students was more impersonal, students were less likely to be affected by teachers opinions.[1]

Systematic School Discipline

Low levels of property loss were found in schools with higher coordination between faculty and administration in enforcing school rules. The study also found lower incidence of school property loss where schools had strict

---

[1] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Violent Schools--Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Volume 1 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1978).

control of classroom behavior. Where students viewed the faculty and administration as having tight control, where the rules were enforced, and where the principal demonstrated firmness, there were lower incidences of student violence.

The perceptions of students is obviously important to the way in which they function in the school. Where there is a program of social interaction among all the school participants and a consistent disciplinary program, the school tends to have better discipline and to be a more orderly and successful place for all the parties who work there.[1]

Arbitrariness and Student Frustration

Where students perceived the administration and staff of the school as arbitrary and they believed the disciplinary program was administered in an unfair manner, higher rates of violence existed in the schools studies. Also, schools where teachers expressed authoritarian and punitive attitudes about students there were greater amounts of property loss.[2]

Squires, Huitt, and Segars have suggested that where students feel unfairly singled out for punishment, crimes tend to increase. Also, teachers may see some students as unruly and begin to develop unfavorable attitudes toward them. These authors suggest that "the cycle of frustration escalates and ends up in violence and property loss."[3]

---

[1] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op. cit., p. 133.

[2] Ibid., p. 134.

[3] David A. Squires, William G. Huitt, and John K. Segars, Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-based Perspective (Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983), p. 51.

A School's Reward Structure

The Safe Schools study concluded that (1) schools where students expressed a strong desire to succeed by getting good grades there was less violence but more property loss, (2) schools where students have a strong desire to be school leaders have greater property losses, and (3) schools where teachers say they lower students' grades as a disciplinary measure have greater property losses.[1]

The study indicated these schools demonstrated "a situation in which the competition for rewards is intense, the availability of rewards is limited and the unfair distribution of rewards is prevalent. These students care about the rewards of the school but see the rewards being unfairly distributed; they react by attacking the school."[2]

Alienation

Where there is a "breakdown of the social bond that ties each individual to society," there is alienation.[3] One of the major findings of the study addresses this concept directly. It states, "Student violence is higher in schools where more students say that they cannot influence what will happen to them--that their future is dependent upon the actions of others or on luck, rather than on their own efforts"[2]

---

[1] U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, op. cit., p. 135.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid., p. 136

SCHOOL CLIMATE

Rutter and his colleagues studied twelve London inner city high schools over a five-year period. In a book entitled, Fifteen Thousand Hours, which is the amount of time a student in London spends in school through high school, he reported that the climate or "ethos" of a school is an important factor in effective schools.[1]

Ethos

Rutter looked at student attainment on exams, student behavior in school, student attendance and absence, and delinquency. He concluded that some of these schools were more effective than others and that there were factors at work which tended to bring about better results in some than in others.

What is ethos? Rutter reports that it is a series of factors which operate in a school which will tell an individual what is the appropriate thing to do even when there is no specific rule to follow. He concluded that the norms and values of a school have an important influence on the success of that school.

Social Structure of a Classroom

Rutter concluded that the social structure of the classroom reflects, reinforces, and supports the climate of the school as a whole. These group norms have an important influence of the performance of the students and the teachers. For example, if one of the norms of the school is that teachers spend considerable time on planning and managing instruction, this behavior will be reflected in individual classrooms as well as throughout the school. Also, students apparently get the message about what school norms expect of

---

[1] M. Rutter, B. Maughan, P. Mortimore, J. Ouston, and A. Smith, Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

them in the classroom. Where the school places importance on students' engagement in the learning task and the student success, these behaviors will be observable in students' classroom performance.[1]

SCHOOL VALUES AND NORMS

Rutter and his colleagues concluded that values and norms of the school are communicated and reinforced through a series of social mechanisms.[2] These are (1) the expectations teachers have about student behavior and achievement, (2) the model the teacher provides the students about work and behavior, (3) the feedback students receive from their teachers concerning what is acceptable in the school, and (4) the consistency of school values communicated to the students by the faculty and staff.[3]

Teacher Expectations

Research shows that when teachers have high expectations of students they tend to achieve at high levels, and when teachers have low expectations of students their achievement tends to decline. Thomas Good has analyzed more than ten years of research on teachers' expectations and concluded that the way teachers behave toward students clearly influences their achievement. Over time, the student's achievement and behavior will conform more and more closely to the teacher's expectations.[3]

One might ask what specific behaviors of teachers bring about these conditions. Good's research has shown that where these have been the results, teachers

---

[1] Rutter et al., op, cit.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Thomas L. Good, "Teacher Expectations and Student Perceptions: A Decade of Research," Educational Leadership, XXXVIII, 5 (February, 1981), 415-421.

. smile more often and have more eye contact with higher achieving students

. pay less attention to lower achieving students

. call on lower achieving students less frequently

. wait less time for lower achieving students to answer

. seat lower achieving students farther away and provide less monitoring of their performance

. interrupt lower achieving students more frequently

. criticize lower achieving students more often for an incorrect answer

. require less effort and work of the lower achieving students

. reinforce lower achieving students less often for a correct or marginal response.

Both the Brookover[1] and the Rutter[2] research point out that these expectations are communicated to students in the ways teachers give assignments, mark homework, give classroom responsibilities, require students to bring books and pencils to class, and provide students with opportunities for leadership in the classroom.

The Teacher As a Model

There can be little doubt that the way teachers conduct themselves conveys to the students information about the standards of behavior acceptable in the school, and these behaviors are reinforced by the school climate. Rutter's research points out that these models are conveyed by the cleanliness and attractiveness of the school, punctuality in starting classes on time,

---

[1] W. Brookover, C. Beady, P. Flood, J. Schweitzer and J. Wisenbaker, School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools can Make a Difference (New York: Praeger, 1979).

[2] Rutter, op. cit.

sensitivity of the faculty to the needs of the students, and concern for giving of teacher's time to assist students in need of help. Negative models are also conveyed when teachers demonstrate the opposite of these characteristics.[1]

Feedback Students Receive

The climate, values, and norms of a school are also conveyed to students by the feedback they get from the faculty and other students. Rutter reports, "Feedback that a child receives about what is and what is not acceptable at school will constitute a powerful influence on his behavior."[2] This research found that the amount of punishment showed only weak, insignificant associations with outcomes, while the amount of reward and praise during lessons was associated with better student behavior. Unfortunately, this research showed that there were three times as many negative reinforcers during lessons than there were positive reinforcers. Rutter also cautioned that the praise which teachers give must be real; that is, those things which teachers commend about student performance should actually have been performed in a manner worthy of praise.

Consistency of Schools' Values

Research reports better student outcomes in schools where teachers planned courses jointly and where expectations for student behavior and discipline were set by the staff as a group. These schools were characterized by administrators who were aware of staff punctuality and homework assignments. They were also schools where decisions were centralized and staff members perceived that their interests were represented in decisions.

---

[1] Rutter, op cit.

[2] Ibid., p. 189.

These consistent schools' values were visible throughout the school and were apparently conveyed by the high proportion of students who held positions of responsibility in the schools. Students were more likely to identify with the schools' goals and to provide positive models of behavior for the other students.[1]

IMPROVED STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

A series of states, i.e., Maryland, New York, Michigan, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and California, have conducted studies which looked at student achievement on standardized achievement tests. Researchers aggregated achievement data by schools, categorized data by SES, and examined processes in high achieving and low-achieving schools. The findings show a difference among schools with students having the same SES levels.

High Achieving Schools

Teachers and administrators expressed positive attitudes about students' abilities to do their academic work, and they were committed to making certain that students learned to read, to do mathematics, and to accomplish their other academic work. Brookover and others reported that their data indicate students perceive that they were expected to learn and the academic norms of the schools were recognized by the students and were viewed by them as setting standards for high achievement. Commitment to these goals were expressed in the instructional activities of the day. In these schools teachers rewarded students for successful performance and did not respond by rewarding mere responses from students but for the correctness of their responses.[2]

---

[1] Rutter, Ibid.

[2] Brookover, op. cit.

Students in these schools feel that they had control of their academic work and they viewed the school program as one through which they could achieve success. Students indicated that they believed that what they did made a difference, was of concern to their teachers, and contributed to their academic achievement.

Low Achieving Schools

Schools in which students achieve at low levels are characterized by students' feelings of futility, especially in terms of their inability to cope with the system which operates in the school. In these schools students reported that they believed teachers were not committed to their high achievement and that, in some cases, they believed teachers would make fun of them if they actually tried to achieve. In these low achieving schools both students and teachers believed that students could only function at a low level. Brookover said,

> Since little is expected and teachers and principals believe that students are not likely to learn at a high level, they devote less time to instructional activity, write off a large proportion of students as unable to learn, differentiate extensively among them, and are likely to praise students for poor achievement [1]

THE PRINCIPAL

Throughout the Seventies many research studies pointed to the importance of the principal in schools where there were significant patterns of achievement and improvement in schools' instructional programs. Wellisch found that administrators in schools where achievement was improving were more concerned with instruction than principals were in schools where achievement was low; they communicated their concerns about the instructional program to the students and staff, and they were active in

---

[1] Brookover, op. cit., pp 143-144.

the instructional program.[1] Weber reported that successful principals in inner-city schools were concerned about the reading achievement of the students and they developed programs designed to improve reading achievement.[2]

A series of other studies have pointed to the principal and the importance of leadership in the instructional program. Some of these studies were conducted by Edmonds,[3] Felsenthal,[4] Irvine,[5] and McLaughlin and Marsh.[6]

THE DEBATE ON INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

While the research on effective schools clearly points to the important role principals play in effective schools, some educational writers have raised questions about this statement. Some teachers and teacher groups have pointed to the fact that teachers, being actively involved in teaching every day, are really the important people in the process. There can be little doubt about the importance of knowledge of teachers; however, this does not detract in any way from the fact that effective principals have significant impact on their schools' instructional programs.

---

[1] J. B. Wellisch, et. al., "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." Sociology of Education 51 (1978) 211, 226.

[2] G. Weber, Inner-City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools CBE Occasional Papers, No. 18 (Washington, D. C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971).

[3] Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, XXXVII, 1, (October 1979), 15-24.

[4] H. Felsenthal, "The Present: What Works in the Teaching of Reading," Paper presented at the 21st Century Expo, Madison, 1978.

[5] D. J. Irvine, "Factors Associated with School Effectiveness," Educational Technology, XIX, 5, (May 1979), 53-55.

[6] M. W. McLaughlin and D. D. Marsh, "Staff Development and School Change," Teachers College Record, LXXX, 1 (September 1978), 69-94.

Other writers, obviously having the view that instructional leadership is best described in terms of the functions performed by curriculum supervisors, question whether principals have time to work with curriculum committees and to write curriculum guides. Obviously, most principals do not function in these ways. However, there is clear evidence that effective principals influence the instructional programs of their schools by almost every act they perform.

A recent analysis of 125 research studies concerning the role of the principal shows that there is a wide range of activities in which principals engage which demonstrate the instructional leadership of the principal.[1] Every phone call, faculty meeting, conversation with parents, students, and faculty, and every communique they write influences the instructional program. Effective principals know how to use these processes to exert their instructional leadership and to improve the instructional program.

CHARACTERISTICS OF EFFECTIVE PRINCIPALS

Recent research has focused on specific behaviors of effective principals. Since the role of the principal is not so well defined that every conceivable behavior is written into the job description, effective principals are guided by their vision of goals they perceive as important for their schools. The following are some important characteristics which permit principals to move toward their vision:

- principals who are effective instructional leaders are also good managers[2]
- a variety of leadership styles can be effective in improving the instructional program[3]

---

[1] Herman E. Behling, Jr., and Robby Champion, The Principal As an Instructional Leader (Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1984).

[2] Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield, The Effective Principal: Perceptives on School Leadership (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980).

[3] Fred Fiedler, "The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience: A Contingency Model Interpretation," Administrative Science Quarterly, XVII, 4, (December 1972), 453-70. (ERIC EJ 068 380)

. effective instructional leaders view constraints positively[1]

. effective instructional leaders are able and aggressive strategists[2]

Gross and Herriott conducted a study of 1/5 elementary school principals and concluded that there is a positive relationship between the principal's leadership and such outcomes as school morale, teacher performance, and student learning.[3]

Effective principals supervise their staffs and conduct staff development in a variety of ways. Hersey and Blanchard concluded that principals who are effective vary their responses to teachers by communicating high or low concern about tasks and high or low concern about interpersonal relationships. They reported that when principals viewed teachers as professionally immature, they gave the teacher more structure and emphasized task, while they gave more mature teachers less task orientation and more relationships orientation.[4]

As was stated earlier, a variety of research studies point to the importance of the principal in the success of the school's instructional program. How this happens is not always apparent to the casual observer. Thirty-three behaviors have been identified from a variety of studies which show that the principal's influence can be either direct or indirect. [5] Only in-depth studies of the principal reveal the full extent of that person's influence on the instructional program.[6]

---

[1] Lloyd E. McCleary and Scott D. Thomson, The Senior High School Principalship Volume III: The Summary Report (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979).

[2] Ibid.

[3] N. Gross and R. E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley, 1965).

[4] Paul Hersey and Kenneth H. Blanchard, Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977).

[5] Behling and Champion, op. cit., pp 41-43.

[6] Harry F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography (Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973).
David C. Dwyer, Ginny V. Lee, Brian Rowan, and Steven Bossert, Five Principals in Action: Perspectives on Instructional Management (Far West Laboratory: San Francisco, March 1983).

DESCRIPTIVE STUDIES - THE JOURNALISTS' REPORT

In 1979 a group of journalists studied the research on effective schools and visited schools across the country which they thought were effective or were achieving better than one might expect. They then described what were important characteristics of these schools. While this method of gathering data is not research of the same kind as others reported in this paper, the results, nevertheless, ring true and are worthy of study. The following are some quotes from that study:

> "Good principals tend to rock the boat. They forsake the desire to be loved for the hard task of monitoring students' progress. They set achievement goals for their students, and they judge their teachers and themselves by them."
>
> "Principals demand--and get--results, but allow flexibility in achieving them."
>
> "Good schools have quality principles....They believe that students can learn--that the job can be done."
>
> "Students achievement results from time spend directly and efficiently on teaching academic skills."
>
> "Effective teachers were able to maintain discipline in their classes....They planned their lessons in advance....They were able to structure their classrooms....They cared for the students, had a sense of pride in teaching, and were relatively satisfied with teaching in a particular school."[1]

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since 1970 a tremendous amount of research has been done on effective schools, and Walberg has identified more than 2,700 research findings related to effective schools and effective classrooms. He has called this accumulation of data "The Quiet Revolution."[2] While these studies do not answer all the questions educators may ask

---

[1] D. Brundage, The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School? (Washington, D. C. George Washington University, 1979).

[2] Herbert J. Walberg, Diane Schiller, and Geneva D. Haertel, "The Quiet Revolution in Education Research," Phi Delta Kappan, (November 1979), 179-183.

about effective schools, they provide information which comes from studies of urban, suburban, and rural schools, studies of achievement, studies which look at teachers, principals, and school belief systems. This kind of information can be of significant value to school personnel who are trying to improve their instructional programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, G. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership 37,1 (October 1979): 10-14.

Averch, H. A. How Effective is Schooling? A Critical Review of Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.

Barber, C. "Training Principals and Teachers for Mastery Learning." Educational Leadership 37,2 (November 1973): 126-127

Behling, Herman E., Jr. What Recent Research Says About Effective Schools and Effective Classrooms. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1981.

Behling, Herman E., Jr., and Champion, Robby. The Principal As an Instructional Leader. Baltimore: Maryland State Department of Education, 1984.

Benjamin, R. "Toward Effective Urban Schools: A National Study." In The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School? Edited by D. Brundage. Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, 1979.

Berman, P. "Educational Change: An Implementation Paradigm." In Improving Schools: Using What We Know. Edited by R. Lehming and M. Kane. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Blumberg, Arthur, and Greenfield, William. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Brookover, W.; Beady, C.; Flood, P.; Schweitzer, J.; and Wisenbaker, J. School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference. New York: Praeger, 1979.

Brundage, D., ed. The Journalism Research Fellows Report: What Makes an Effective School? Washington, D. C.: George Washington University, 1979.

Carroll, J. B. "A Model of School Learning." Teachers College Record 64 (1963): 723-733.

Corbett, H. D. "Principals' Contributions to Maintaining Change." Phi Delta Kappan 64,3 (November 1982): 190-192

Duckett, W.; Park, D.; Clark, D.; McCarthy, M.; Lotto, L.; Gregory, L.; Herling, J.; and Burlson, D. Why Do Some Schools Succeed? The Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Elementary Schools. Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.

Dwyer, David C.; Lee, Ginny V.; Rowan, Brian; and Bossert, Steven. Five Principals in Action: Perspectives on Instructional Management. Far West Laboratory: San Francisco, March 1983.

Edmonds, R. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership 37,1 (October 1979): 15-24.

Felsenthal, H. "The Present: What Works in the Teaching of Reading." Paper presented at the 21st Century Expo, Madison, 1978.

Fiedler, Fred. "The Effects of Leadership Training and Experience: A Contingency Model Interpretation." Administrative Science Quarterly 17,4 (December 1972): 453-70. (ERIC EJ 068 380)

Gross, N., and Herriott, R. E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley, 1965.

Hersey, Paul, and Blanchard, Kenneth H. Management of Organizational Behavior: Utilizing Human Resources. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1977.

Irvine, D. J. "Factors Associated with School Effectiveness." Educational Technology 29,5 (1979): 53-55.

Lehming, R., and Kane, M., eds. Improving Schools: Using What we Know. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, 1981.

Little, J. W. "School Success and Staff Development in Urban Desegregated Schools: A Summary of Recently Completed Research." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April 1981.

McCleary, Lloyd E., and Thomson, Scott D. The Senior High School Principalship Volume III: The Summary Report. Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

Mann, Dale. The Instructional Effective School: A Planning and Feasibility Study. A Report Prepared for the Carnegie Corporation of New York. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1979.

Maryland State Department of Education. Process Evaluation: A Comprehensive Study of Outliers. Baltimore: The Maryland State Department of Education, 1978.

McLaughlin, M. W., and Marsh, D. D. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record 80,1 (1978): 69-94.

Medley, D. M. Teacher Competence and Teacher Effectiveness. Washington, D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Evaluation, 1977.

Rutter, M.; Maughan, B.; Mortimore, P.; Ouston, J.; and Smith, A. Fifteen Thousand Hours: Secondary Schools and Their Effects on Children. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Squires, D. Characteristics of Effective Schools: The Importance of School Processes. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc., 1980. (ERIC Document No. ED 197 486.)

Squires, David A., Huitt, William G., and Segars, John K. Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. Alexandria, Va.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1983.

Squires, D.; Huitt, W.; and Segars, J. "Improving Classrooms and Schools: What's Important." Educational Leadership 39,3 (December 1981): 174-179.

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Violent Schools--Safe Schools: The Safe School Study Report to the Congress, Volume I. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1978.

Vann, A. "Three Principals Discuss the Principal's Leadership Role. Can Principals Lead in Curriculum Development?" Educational Leadership 36,6 (March 1979): 404-405.

Weber, G. Inner-City Children Can be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. CBE Occasional Papers, No. 18. Washington, D. C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Wellisch, J. B.; MacQueen, A. H.; Carriere, R. A.; and Duck, F. A. "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." Sociology of Education 51 (1978): 211, 226.

Wiley, D. E., and Harnischfeger, A. "Explosion of a Myth: Quantity of Schooling and Exposure to Instruction, Major Educational Vehicles." Educational Researcher 4,3 (1974): 7-11.

Wolcott, Harry F. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1973.